necessary to be produced in response to the subpoena. There was some discussion, but no resolution, as to the manner in which the request would be made -- whether it would be a blanket request, or whether it would define classifications of documents, which might lead to a rejection of the request in part and a granting of it in part.

2. The companies argued that, as they read the Court's Order of December 15, 1952, they should seek permission from foreign governments for the exportation of documents -- and they asked the State Department to assume their burden in view of political conditions -- even where there is no existing written official prohibition upon the removal of documents. The Justice Department opposed this proposal, stating that the Court's Order of December 15, 1952 could not correctly be so read, and that permission should be sought only where there was an existing prohibition.

3. Some of the companies, notably the Texas Company, further urged that the Department, on behalf of the companies, should request permission of a foreign government before the company produced copies of documents located in the United States which related to dealings between the company and that foreign government. Justice Department opposed this proposal, stating that there was nothing in the Court's order which justified requesting the foreign sovereign's permission for disclosure by an American Company of documents located in the United States required to be produced by a subpoena approved by the United States courts.

Mr. Fisher suggested that a letter be addressed to the Court, setting forth the agreement on Point 1 as set forth above, and the questions that had been raised with respect to Points 2 and 3 above, and asking the Court's clarification on these latter points. Several company attorneys, however, suggested, and it was then agreed, that instead of writing a letter to the Court, the Court be asked to hear the companies, the Justice Department and Mr. Fisher at an informal hearing on January 6, 1953, the following day. An appointment was then made with Judge Kirkland, who agreed that the parties might appear before him informally at 10 A.M. on January 6, 1953. At that point, the meeting closed.

L:L/E:SDMetzger:blm

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR

REVIEWED BY CEC DATE 7-1-81

RDS☐or XDS☐EXT. DATE

TS AUTH. REASON(S)

ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐

DECLASSIFIED☑ RELEASABLE☑

RELEASE DENIED☐

FA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

DECLASSIFIED 11/13

Standard Oil Company of California

John T. Cahill

John F. Sonnett

William M. Sayre

Socony-Vacuum Oil Company, Inc.

George S. Leisure

Goldthwaite H. Dorr

The Texas Company

S.A.L. MORgan

O. J. Dorwin

J. J. Wilson

The California Texas Oil Co., Ltd.

A. E. Van Dusen

Leo T. Kissam

Standard Vacuum Oil Co.

Fowler Hamilton

Warroch Wallace

George Collins

DEPARTMENT OF STATE A/CDC/MR
PREVIEWED BY CRC DATE 7-1-81
or XD? EXT. DATE
TS AUTH. REASON(S)
ENDORSE EXISTING MARKINGS ☐
DECLASSIFIED ☑ RELEASABLE ☑
RELEASE DENIED ☐
FA or FOI EXEMPTIONS

DECLASSIFIED